

REMARKS

Claims 17-24 and 26-33 remain in this application. Claim 17 has been amended in this response. No new matter has been introduced as a result of the amendment. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. Applicant also requests entry and reconsideration of the amendments filed on October 11, 2005.

The Advisory Action did not enter the previously proposed amendments to the specification and drawings due to two specific reasons, detailed in the continuation sheet of the Advisory Action. In response to the first issue, Applicant notes that FIG. 1 illustrates a closed mobile radiotelephone device “under an exemplary embodiment.” The remaining figures provide additional details “under the exemplary embodiment.” Thus, the language in the specification comports with the Examiner’s interpretation that the figures are related to the same embodiment. Regarding the open and closed positions, the Applicant has clarified the specification in this regard, and further notes that the physical position of mobile radiotelephone device may be open or closed in the illustrations of FIGs. 3-4. Indeed, claim 17 recites that both bodies contain interfaces, where optical signals are coupled “regardless of the position of an interface.” Further support may be found in the amended specification, page 7, line 15 to page 8, line 22.

Regarding the second issue, Applicant respectfully submits the Advisory Action misinterprets the bus 150 as being an “electrical bus.” The first sentence of the specification recites that “[t]he present invention relates to a radio/telephone system for transmission of optical signals via two optically conductive bodies that form a bus system.” In the paragraph cited by the Advisory Action the text provides that the components within each shell are electrically connected, while the opto-electronic components in the upper and lower shell are in optical contact (i.e., “not electrically connected”). Furthermore, the specification provides in the second paragraph of the Summary:

The optical bodies of the bus system are arranged above one another or layered on top of one another such that they are movable relative to one another and thereby simultaneously remain in optical contact with one another, so that a largely faultless transmission of optical signals is always assured between the two components of the telephone set, telephone receiver or mobile radiotelephone device.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the disclosure comports with the previously amended matter, and that these amendments did not constitute “new matter.”

Claims 17-22, 24, 26-31 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Buhrmann et al.* (US Patent 5,854,984). Claims 23 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Buhrmann et al.* (US Patent 5,854,984) in view of *Woodward et al.* (US Patent 6,259,188). At the outset, Applicant respectfully submits that the substantive portion of the response dated October 11, 2005, was not addressed in the Advisory Action. Applicant traverses these rejections for the reasons given below.

Buhrmann does not teach or suggest a light emitting element and a light receiving element, and further does not disclose the first body and the second body being movable relative to one another and in optical contact with one another, and “that an optical signal input at any one of the first plurality and the second plurality of interfaces is coupled at another one of the first plurality and the second plurality of interfaces, regardless of a position of an interface” as recited in claim 17. As argued previously, *Buhrmann* merely generally discloses that contacts 57 and 80 could be optical contacts. However, *Buhrmann* does not teach the structure of the optical contacts being light emitting element or a light receiving element, operating in the configuration recited in the present claims.

The structure of *Buhrmann* makes it such that the contacts 57 and 80 are operable only in one position (see FIG. 1; col. 4, lines 4-7). While *Buhrmann* discloses alternate embodiments of the pager relative to the handset using (1) non-recessed surfaces, (2) slidably attaching, or (3) rotatably attaching (i.e., flip-phone), there is nothing in the disclosure that teaches or suggests that the configuration will maintain optical contact regardless of the position. The disclosure is clear in teaching that the pager is removably attached as a module to the handset, and that no continuous contact is disclosed or intended.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 17 of the present application, as well as Claims 18-24 and 26-33 which respectfully depend therefrom, are both novel and nonobvious over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely notice of allowance be issued in this case. If any additional fees are due in connection with this Application as a whole, the office is hereby authorized to deduct said fees

from deposit account number 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the Attorney Docket No. (0112740-465) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY


Peter Zura

Reg. No. 48,196
Customer No.: 29177
Phone: (312) 807-4208

Dated: December 7, 2005